



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/675,341

09/30/2003

Min Kuo

66329/31351

5786

23380 7590 07/02/2009

TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP  
1150 HUNTINGTON BUILDING  
925 EUCLID AVENUE  
CLEVELAND, OH 44115-1414

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, MYLES D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/02/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@tuckerellis.com

christopher.luoma@tuckerellis.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/675,341	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KUO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Myles D. Robinson	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Myles D. Robinson. (3) John Garred.

(2) Chan Park. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 June 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: N/A.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kageyama (U.S. 7,092,117) in view of Ferlitsch (U.S. 2004/0190042).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant clarified the inventive concept and explained how the proposed amendments should overcome the prior art. The Examiner disagreed and then pointed out how the prior art of record meets the finally rejected claims as well as the proposed amendments.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/CHAN S PARK/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2625	
--	--